

The Relationship Between Organizational Health and Bullying That Teachers Experience in Primary Schools in Turkey

*Necati Cemaloğlu
Gazi University*

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between organizational health and the bullying that teachers experience in primary schools in Turkey. Two measurement instruments were used in this research. The Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-S), Hoy and Miskel, (1991) was used to measure organizational health. The Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ), developed by Einarsen and Raknes (1997) was used to measure bullying, the other variable of the research. The NAQ was adapted to Turkish for linguistic and cultural reasons. The OHI-S and NAQ were administered to the 337 teachers making up the sampling of the research. In this study, Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for all variables. Later, by using the 7 sub-scales of the OHI-S as the independent variables and school bullying as the dependent variable, a multiple regression analysis was done. At the end of the research, it was found that from among the organizational health subdimensions, Initiating Structure (IS) 4.70 was more frequently realized, The Academic Emphasis (AE) 10.18 subdimension was less frequently realized and 50% of the teachers were exposed to bullying. Hence, there was a negative relationship between organizational health and teachers' exposure to bullying, and organizational health was an indicator of bullying experience.

Introduction

There are various factors in the organizational structure of schools which affect communication among teachers. Research in the relevant areas suggest that teachers are exposed to considerable work loads which results in stress and frustration, and that at least

one third of teachers suffer from overstress and fatigue (Boyle, Borg, Falzon, and Baglioni, 1995; Capel, 1991; Friesen, Prokop, and Sarros, 1988; Friesen and Sarros, 1989; Dick and Wagner, 2001). Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1978) categorize the causes of stress in teachers into two types, physical and psychological. In other studies, there are issues mentioned, such as the low status of the profession, insufficient salary, behaviors and attitudes of managers, interpersonal relations, role conflicts, and supervision and communication type (Borg and Riding, 1991; Pehlivan, 1993; Aslan, 1995; Tmkaya, 1996; Ataklı, 1999; Demir, 1997; Kayum, 2002; zdayı, 1990). Research shows that there is a significant relationship between bullying in other types of organizations and stress in workers (Brodsky, 1976; Einarsen, Matthiesen and Skogstad, 1998; Zapf, Knorz, and Kulla, 1996). Einarsen and Raknes (1997) suggest that 23% of male workers who are bullying victims in organizations suffer from psychological disorders and frustrations; there are psychological and psychosomatic disorders found in most bullying victims. It was found that workers suffer from low self-esteem, anxiety, depression, lack of concentration, chronic fatigue, sleeping disorders, digestive problems, headaches, pain in the loins, irritability, self hatred, and suicidal tendencies (Bjorkqvist, Osterman and Hjelt-Back, 1994; Brodsky, 1976; Einarsen, Raknes, Matthiesen, and Hellesay, 1996; Leymann, 1990). Jennifer, Cowie, and Ananiadou (2003) describe bullying as a recurring condition in workers which causes stress. A condition must be recurring for at least six months to be considered bullying. The characteristic definition of bullying is that it is exposure to negative behaviors which have been recurring for quite some time. Contrary to conflict between workers in an organization, bullying is the systemic aggression by some towards one or more target persons (Hoel, Rayner & Cooper, 1999).

Leymann (1993) presents evidence that poor occupational organization and administrative problems result in bullying. The research by Einarsen, Raknes, and Matthiesen (1994), Vartia (1996), and Zapf and Osterwalder (1998) support this view. All suggest that there is a strong relationship between organizational variables and bullying. According to Leymann (1996), some of the

reasons for bullying in organizations can be organizational relationships, dominance problems within organizations and leadership styles in organizations. Leadership, organizational culture, work stress, and occupational organizational type are suggested as the reasons for bullying. It is impossible for strong interpersonal relations to take exist in an organization with poor organizational health. However, job satisfaction of teachers and their performance is assumed to be high in educational organizations with good interpersonal relations. Generally, it has been found in research that there is a relationship among organizational health and renewal, effectivity, leadership, management, communication, and organizational product (Hoy & Feldman, 1987). this has been effective in the consideration of organizational health as a notable variable affecting the structural, interpersonal and environmental aspects of an organization. It is considered that there may be a relationship between bullying at a school and the organizational health of that school. The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between organizational health and the bullying that teachers experience in primary schools in Turkey.

“Organizational health” is an important concept within educational organizations. However, the concept of organizational health was introduced into Turkish literature quite late. A literature review shows that the concept of organizational health was only mentioned in articles and books on administrative science in 1970. Başaran (1991) considered school health as a subcategory of organizational health in his book entitled *Organizational Behavior*. Can (1992) described organizational health and its principles in his work *Organization and Management*, and Akbaba carried out the most comprehensive research on educational institutions in 1997. In his doctoral dissertation entitled *Organizational Health in Secondary Schools*, Akbaba describes organizational leadership, organizational integrity, interaction, organizational identity, and organizational products as the indicators of organizational health. In his article, “The Relationship between Organizational Health and Robust School Vision in Elementary School,” Korkmaz (2004)

clarified the theoretical basis for organizational health and vision.

When the relevant literature on bullying in Turkey is analyzed it is found that there have been only a few research projects published so far. Davenport's work, *Bullying* was translated into Turkish in 2003. Also, there are articles by Yüçetürk which were published in 2003 entitled "Unstoppable Bullying Applications in Organizations: A Dream or Reality?" and "The Dark Side of the Organizations: Bullying." There is also the article by Baltaş (2003) entitled "A Phenomenon Recently Entitled: Bullying in the Work Place." Thus, there is an overall paucity of research in Turkey on both organizational health and bullying.

Workplace Bullying

The existence of bullying (mobbing) is one of the notable causes of anxiety among workers. The term bullying was used among animals in the 1960s and was later used to describe similar behavior encountered in children. In 1980s, as Leymann suggested, bullying was also encountered in adults in the work place (Davenport, 2003: 3). Further Maguire (1999) described bullying as "the war in organizations without blood" (Westhues, 2004: 37).

A victim (a victim is characterized as someone being subjected to bullying) is exposed to negative behaviors with ever increasing frequency and violence (Einarsen, 2000). Furthermore, these behaviors are complicated, having the characteristics of non-physical and verbal insults. Theoretically, bullying is the source of stress in organizations. Bullying, as a particular social source of stress is the systemic oppression of a worker over time (Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996; Leymann, 1996; Zapf, Knorz & Kulla, 1999; Zapf, 1996). On the other hand, bullying also comes to mean the psychological aggression towards an individual by a person who is higher in status. However, experimental studies suggest this is not an overt problem (Zapf, 1999).

Research on the causes of the bullying experienced by workers in organizations was carried out in terms of two categories, bullying victims and the setting in which bullying takes place. Einarsen (1999: 17) suggests jealousy as the main reason for bullying. Furthermore, he suggests that the strong expression self

confidence, lack of communication, and lack of harmony in organizations may be factors. Some research shows that bullying victims experience this process mainly because of their self confidence and their image of being out of touch. Those who resort to bullying (the perpetrators) are described as people who can easily be provoked. When perpetrators are studied, the findings suggest that they are aggressive individuals with weak characters (Randall, 1997; Jennifer, Cowie, & Ananiadou, 2003). However, Höel, Rayner, and Cooper (1999) suggest that perpetrators who bully others cannot be considered to have complete characters. In the research carried out by Salmivalli, Lappalainen, and Lagerspetz (1998) at schools, the bullying process was analyzed as consisting of the perpetrator, the accomplice to the perpetrator, a setting conducive to bullying, triggerers, and victim. Zapf (1999) studied the causes of bullying under different terms. A victim is the trigger for bullying as the perpetrator attempts to exclude him from the organization and provokes others against him (hocam bu cumle anlasilmiyor). When categorized in terms of the setting, the other causes of bullying are described as organizational climate, overstress, time pressures, and organizational problems.

Organizational Health

The concept of organizational health was used by Miles in 1969 in his analysis of organizational health in schools. Miles suggested a model for the organizational health of schools and defined a healthy organization in the following terms: "A healthy organization is the one which is not static in its existing setting, but is ever-developing itself and its skills to handle and carry on" (Miles, 1969: 376; Akbaba, 2001: 26). The term "organizational health:" which was first used to express the continuous aspect of organizational health, was defined by Parsons, Bales, and Sils (1953), Hoy and Tarter (1997), and Hoy and Miskel (1991) as the ability for an organization to adapt to its environment, to create harmony among its members, and to achieve to its goals (Korkmaz, 2004: 476). Some researchers have seen a similarity between organizations and humans and have suggested that an organization could be ill or healthy, just like a

person. The organs should be working in perfect harmony for a body to be healthy. Similarly, all sub-systems should be working regularly in harmony for an organization to be healthy. A healthy organization is functional; it functions regularly and can effectively offer goods and services. The health level of the organization is related to its ability to achieve instruments and goals (Altun, 2001).

Brookover (1987) and Akbaba (2001) conceptualized (discussed) school health by using the concept of organizational climate in schools and determined significant variables regarding the effectiveness of schools. Hoy and Feldman (1987) identified criteria for healthy and unhealthy schools after developing the Organizational Health Inventory. Protecting the school against possible pressures from the environment, the leadership of the school administrator, good communication and interaction between teachers, students' achievement, equipment used at school, etc. were included in these criteria. The following criteria were also used for the identification of unhealthy schools: aggression the pressure groups surrounding the school, incompetent school administrators, communication gaps between teachers, conflict, and low academic expectations.

Research on organizational health had its beginning in the late 1970s and rapidly advanced in the 1980s. Clark & Fairman (1983) regarded organizational health as a significant force in planning change. Childer and Fairman (1986) emphasized that counselors at schools may play the role of facilitators in improving organizational health. Kimpston and Sonnabend (1975) studied the relationship between organizational health in secondary schools, innovation and staff characteristics. Ash (1992) analyzed the relationship between organizational health and the opinions of teachers on innovation. Hoy, Tarter, and Bliss (1990) compared the effectiveness of organizational climate and organizational health. Podgurski (1990) researched the relationship between school effectiveness and organizational health in primary schools, while El-Hage (1980) studied the relationship between organizational health and effectiveness. Scherrey (1991) studied the relationship between the self-realization of school managers and the organizational health of schools. Fliegner (1984) studied the relationship between school leadership and organizational health. Ransom (1990) studied the relationship between organizational

health and the elements of participatory management. As Hoy and Miskel (1991) and Hoy and Tarter (1997) state, in a healthy school, the technical, managerial and personnel institutional levels are in harmony, and the harmony between these three levels should be made manifesting teaching and student learning (Korkmaz, 2004: 477).

The studies carried out on organizational health abroad have also affected the Turkish educational system. The consideration of organizational health as a variable which affects organizational performance within the Turkish educational system resulted in various new legal regulations. Concepts such as organizational effectiveness, leadership, performance assessment, and quality assurance also have begun to be discussed in our educational system. Seminars, courses, and certification programs are being organized based on such concepts. Thesis and non-thesis graduate educational programs have been created to improve the quality of teachers and school managers.

The Aim of the Research

The aim of this research is to identify the relationship between the organizational health of primary schools in Turkey and bullying towards teachers. Answers will be sought for the following questions:

1. What are the opinions of primary school teachers regarding the organizational health of their schools?
2. What are the opinions of primary school teachers about the frequency of bullying behaviors that they experienced at school?
3. According to primary school teachers, is there a significant relation ship between their views on organizational health in their schools and the bullying they experience at school?

Method

Sample

The source of data for this research comprises 399,025 teachers who taught in primary schools in Turkey during the 2004-2005 academic year. The sample of this research consists of 385

primary school teachers who attended the courses in-service training center courses in Aksaray and Yalova- Çınarcık-Esenköy between July 4th-22nd 2005. Teachers from 7 different regions of Turkey attended the course. These teachers came from communities and backgrounds of different socio-economic levels, and each was from a different school. Therefore, the data for the research were obtained from a wide area. The reason why in-service training centers were selected for the sampling is that there are problems of implementing research on organizational health and bullying in schools where both school administrators and teachers work. Also, the Ministry of National Education selected the teachers invited to the in-service training centers. Research questionnaires were given to 385 primary school teachers. Forty-one questionnaires were sent back. Seven questionnaires were not filled out according to the instructions: therefore they were considered invalid (outside the scope of the research). A total of 337 questionnaires were evaluated. In the sampling, 44.39% of the teachers were male and 45.7 % female: 63.8 % were married, 33.2 % were single, and 2.7 % were either divorced or widowed. When the age diversification among the teachers in the sampling was analyzed, it was observed that 63.5 % were between 23-35. As for the ages between 36 – 48, it was 33.2 % and 3.59 % were 49 or older. The sample group consisted of young teachers. When the branch diversification was analyzed, it was observed that 70.6% were secondary school teachers and 29.4% were primary school teachers.

Instruments

The Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-S): This scale was developed by Hoy and Miskel (1991) to measure organizational health. Revised forms of the OHI-S were also published by Hoy and Tarter (1997) and Hoy and Sabo (1998). The OHI-S developed by Licata and Harper (2001) was composed of 33 items distributed across 6 sub-scales accounting for approximately 77 % of the cumulative variance. Relatively high alpha reliability coefficient for these sub-scales ranged from .82 to .92. The instrument used by Licata and Harper (2001) for their research was also used in the study. Korkmaz (2004:480) also used this instrument in his research.

Permission to use was granted by Hoy. The Organizational

Health Inventory (OHI-S). The instrument was adapted to Turkish because of linguistic and cultural differences that would affect translation. For reliability and validity, a pilot study was undertaken involving 145 teachers from 6 schools was done. After this, a factor analysis was carried out. As a result of the factor analysis, 39 items were identified as being distributed across 7 subscales, accounting for 62 % of the cumulative variance. Five items were omitted from the OHI-S, as their factor loadings were under 0.30.

Although Institutional Integrity 2 and Morale (M) 1 were under a 0.30 factor loading, expert opinion was elicited and it was determined to use these in the research. The alpha level was 0.93. The Alpha levels for the subscales were Institutional Integrity (II) 0.60, Initiating Structure (IS) 0.79, Consideration (C) 0.90, Principal Influence (PI) 0.71, Resource Support (RS) 0.92, Morale (M) 0.89, and Academic Emphasis (AE) 0.82. The Factor loads of the subscales and the article numbers were as follows: Institutional Integrity (II) 6 items, factor loading 0.23 -0.45. Initiating Structure (IS) 4 items, factor loading 0.59 -0.68, Consideration (C). 5 items factor loading 0.57 - 0.76, Principal Influence (PI) 4 items, factor loading 0.42 - 0.72, Resource Support (RS) 5 items, factor loading 0.71 - 0.81, Morale (M) 8 items, factor loading 0.29 – 0.72, and Academic Emphasis (AE). 7 items, factor loading 0.34 - 0.62.

The responses varied along a four-point scale defined by the categories “Rarely Occurs”, “Sometimes Occurs”, “Often Occurs” and “Frequently Occurs.” as (1 through 4, respectively). When an item is reversely scored, “Rarely Occurs” receives a 4, “Sometimes Occurs”, a 3, and so on. Each item was scored for each respondent, and then an average school score for each item was computed by averaging the item responses for the school, because the school was the unit of analysis. These seven scores represent the health profile of the schools. The arithmetic mean, standard deviation, and maximum scores were calculated for each sub-scale.

The Sub-scales of the OHI-S cover the following issues. “Institutional Integrity” (II) describes a school that has integrity in its educational program: the school is not vulnerable to narrow, vested interests of community groups; indeed, teachers are

protected from unreasonable community and parental demands. The school is able to cope successfully with destructive external forces. Initiating Structure (IS) refers to task- and achievement-oriented behavior. The principal makes his or her attitudes and expectations clear to the faculty and maintains definite standards of performance. Consideration (C) refers to a principal's behavior that is friendly and supportive. The principal takes responsibility for the welfare of faculty members and is open to their suggestions. Principal Influence (PI) refers to the principal's ability to affect the actions of superiors. Influential principals are persuasive, work effectively with superintendents, and simultaneously demonstrate independence in thought and action. Resource Support (RS) refers to adequate classroom supplies and instructional materials are available and extra materials in schools.. Morale (M) refers to a sense of trust, confidence, enthusiasm, and friendliness among teachers. Teachers respect each other and, at the same time, feel a sense of accomplishment from their jobs. Academic Emphasis (AE) refers to school pressure for achievement. High but achievable goals are set for students; the learning environment is orderly and serious; teachers believe students can achieve; and students work hard and respect those who do well academically.

Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ): The NAQ was developed by Einarsen & Raknes (1997) and was used for the measurement of bullying, the second major variable of the research. Exposure to bullying behaviors was measured by the Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ) (Einarsen & Raknes, 1997). In this study, the scale comprised 18 items (Cronbach's alpha =0.83) which measure exposure to various negative acts. All items use behavioral terms which make no reference to the term "bullying" (see Table 2 for an overview of the items included in this scale). This has the advantage of measuring perceived exposure to behaviors without forcing the respondents to label these behaviors as bullying. The method used to chart exposure to bullying in the present study seems to prevent an underestimation of the problem, which may occur when using methods where individuals label themselves as victims of bullying (Brooks & Perot, 1991). It also secures a somewhat more objective

description of the behaviors involved (see also Frese & Zapf, 1988; Mikkelsen & Einarsen: 2002).

The NAQ contains items referring to either direct (e.g., verbal abuse, offensive remarks, ridicule) or indirect (e.g., social ostracism, slander) behaviors. For each item of the NAQ, the respondents were asked how often they had been exposed to the behavior during the previous six months. The response categories were "Never, Now or Then, About Weekly," and about daily. A weekly exposure to such negative acts over a period of six months has been proposed as an operational definition of victimization due to bullying at work (Leymann, 1996; Mikkelsen & Einarsen: 2002).

The Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ) was adapted for the research study to account for the linguistic, expressional and cultural structures. For reliability and validity, a pilot study was undertaken involving 145 teachers from 6 schools. After this, a factor analysis was carried out. As a result of the factor analysis, 18 items were identified as being distributed across 7 subscales accounting for 67 % of the cumulative variance. In this study, the scale comprised 18 items (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.97$), measuring exposure to various negative acts. The factor loadings were between 0.42 - 0.82.

Statistical Procedures

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated for all variables. Pearson correlation coefficients were computed for the relationship between the mean scores for school bullying and the mean scores gathered for the OHI-S. Later, by using the 7 sub-scales of the OHI-S as independent variables and school bullying as the dependent variable, a multiple regression analysis was done.

Results

Table 1. Summary of Descriptive Statistics for OHI-S

<i>OHI-S (No. Of items in scale)</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Max-M</i>
Institutional Integrity (II) (6)	16.29	3.22	23.00	6.71
Initiating Structure (IS) (4)	11.30	2.98	16.00	4.70
Consideration (C) (5)	13.06	4.40	20.00	6.94

Principal Influence (PI) (4)	10.18	2.52	16.00	5.82
Resource Support (RS) (5)	11.86	4.32	20.00	8.14
Morale (M) (8)	22.33	5.38	32.00	9.67
Academic Emphasis (AE) (7)	17.82	4.53	28.00	10.18
OHI-S Total (39)	103.76	20.32	149.00	45.24

Note: OHI-S= Organizational Health Inventory,

The *Max-M* values for the sub-dimensions of the Organizational Health Inventory are analyzed in Table 1. The “Initiating Structure” (IS) 4.70 dimension is very frequently realized, while the “Academic Emphasis” (AE) 10.18 subdimension is less often realized. The Organizational Health Inventory scores for the schools are quite high.

Teachers Perception of Principal Influence (PI), which was a sub-scale of the OHI-S, had the lowest standard deviation. In other words, it was the variable with the highest homogeneity. The biggest change in teacher perception, except for the Standard Deviation given to the whole OHI-S, belongs to the Morale sub-scale. That is, it is in this sub-scale that the variable has the lowest degree of homogeneity in teacher perception. Table 1 shows the 39- item OHI-S, its sub-scales, and the number of items related to the sub-scales.

As seen in Table 2, almost 50% of the teachers stated that they were exposed to some bullying behaviors, for example, “Neglect of Your Opinions or Views 52,6%.” The most frequent bullying the teachers daily faced was someone withholding Necessary Information affecting your performance”(5.89).the least frequent one was “Being Deprived of Responsibility or Work Tasks”(1.29) The least observed bullying behavior in primary schools was Ridicule (87,2%). However, 6.4% reported exposure to at least one bullying act weekly or more often, during the previous six months. Thus, the subjects were potential victims of bullying, according to the criteria suggested by Leymann (1996). Exposure to two different types of bullying behaviors weekly or more often were reported respectively by 5.4 % and 6.4% of the respondents. Table 2 shows the incidence of the various bullying acts in this sample.

Table 2. Percentage of Employees Endorsing Each Item on the NAQ

During the last six months, how often have you been subjected to the following negative acts in the work place?	Never %	Now and Then %	About Weekly %	About Daily %
1. Someone withholding necessary information affecting your performance	61.5	30.3	2.4	5.8
2. Insulting teasing	75.5	19.0	2.4	3.0
3. Being ordered to do work below your level of competence	44.8	43.9	6.4	4.8
4. Being deprived of responsibility or work tasks	76.1	19.4	3.3	1.2
5. Slander or rumors about you	72.2	22.4	2.4	3.0
6. Social exclusion from work group activities by co-workers	84.3	13.3	-	2.4
7. Repeated offensive remarks about your person or your private life	85.8	10.0	1.8	2.4
8. Verbal abuse	81.0	14.2	2.1	2.7
9. Ridicule	87.2	10.3	0.3	2.1
10. Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job	84.2	12.5	0.6	2.7
11. Repeated reminders of your blunders	76.6	18.8	1.8	2.7
12. Silence or hostility as a response to your questions or attempts at conversations	75.6	19.2	2.1	3.0
13. Devaluation of your work and efforts	58.8	31.2	4.8	5.2
14. Neglect of your opinions or views	52.6	37.5	5.4	4.5
15. Devaluation of your "rights" and opinions with reference to your gender	84.8	10.0	1.5	3.6
16. Devaluation of your "rights"	80.1	14.1	3.1	2.8

and opinions with reference to your age				
17. Exploitation at work, such as private errands	79.9	13.7	3.4	3.0
18. Negative reactions from others because you work too hard	58.5	33.6	4.2	3.6

Table 3 summarizes the Pearson product-moment correlations among all the variables used in the study.

Table 3. Correlations Between the OHI-S and NAQ Scales

	IS	C	PI	RS	M	AE	OHI-S Total	NAQ
II	0.22 *	0.33 *	0.21*	0.15*	0.37*	0.12*	0.44*	-0.27*
IS	—	0.69 *	0.62*	0.53*	0.48*	0.54*	0.78*	-0.31*
C		—	0.59*	0.54*	0.53*	0.48*	0.83*	-0.35*
PI			—	0.48*	0.38*	0.45*	0.70*	-0.15*
RS				—	0.42*	0.63*	0.75*	-0.24*
M					—	0.62*	0.79*	-0.37*
AE						—	0.79*	-0.25*
OHI-S Total							—	-0.46*

Note: OHI-S= Organizational Health Inventory, (NAQ)= Negative Acts Questionnaire
*p < 0.01

The relationships among the sub-scales of the OHI-S were rated as Moderate to High Level. These correlation coefficients were between 0.12 and 0.69 and were higher than the ones first developed for middle schools (Hoy & Sabo, 1998; Korkmaz, 2004:481). They were closer to the correlations for the values which Licata and Harper (2001) found for middle schools. The strongest relationships among the sub-scales were between Teacher Perception of the Initiating Structure (IS) by the school and teachers' views about "Consideration" (C) ($r=.69$, $p < 0.01$). This relationship was mutual. . That is, wherever there was an increase in the views of teachers about Initiating Structure (IS), there was also an increase in the views of

teachers about “Consideration” (C). This finding may result from the fact that the Initiating Structure (IS) and the Consideration (C) sub-scales complement each other in terms of content.

There was a highly positive significant relationship between Resource Support (RS) and Academic Emphasis (AE) ($r=.63$, $p < 0.01$). The findings of the present study were similar to the findings of Davis (1989), Conley (1992) and Korkmaz (2004), in that there is a parallel relationship between Resource Support and Academic Emphasis, which can be thought of as resulting from effective leadership in schools. This was due to the fact that two important factors of leadership were Interpersonal Positive Relationship and Developing School Health. The lowest relationship was between Institutional Integrity (II) and Academic Emphasis (AE) ($r=.12$, $p < 0.01$).

The correlation coefficient between the total scores for the OHI-S and the NAQ was ($r=.46$, $p < 0.01$). In other words, it was observed that there was a highly negative significant relationship between the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-S) and the Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ). This suggests that the level of bullying decreases at schools as their organizational health scores of the school increase.

When the relationship between the sub-measures of the Organizational Health (OHI-S) Scale and the Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ) was analyzed; it was observed that the highest level of negative significant relationship was in the Morale (M) sub-scale ($r= -.37$, $p < 0.01$), while the lowest level was in the Principal Influence (PI) ($r= -.15$, $p < 0.01$) sub-scales. There was a moderate level of negative significant relationship between the sub-scales of the Organizational Health Inventory and the (OHI-S) Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ). Other research studies on organizational health found a relationship between the Vision of the School (Logan, 1993; Willower & Jones, 1965; Korkmaz, 2004), Administrative Stress (Trasher, 1980), Participation in Decision Making Mechanism (Ransom, 1991), Student Achievement, (Hoy and Woolfolk, 1993), Teacher-Teacher and Senior-subordinate Relationship (Hardage, 1978), and Student Achievement (Allison, 1992).

Regression analyses of the sub-scale measurements for the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-S) survey and the Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ) are given in Table-4.

Table 4. Multiple Regression Analysis

	B	Standard Error	β	t	p	Correlations Zero-order	Partial
Constant	47,001	3,534	-	13,300	0,000	-	-
II	-0,380	0,180	-0,136	-2,110	0,036	-0,307	-0,141
IS	-0,306	0,281	-0,097	-1,092	0,276	-0,344	-0,074
C	-0,496	0,193	-0,234	-2,566	0,011	-0,421	-0,171
PI	-0,434	0,288	-0,121	-1,505	0,134	-0,219	-0,101
RS	-0,025	0,169	-0,012	-0,146	0,884	-0,266	-0,010
M	-0,445	0,142	-0,252	-3,123	0,002	-0,442	-0,206
AE	-0,016	0,183	-0,007	-0,085	0,932	-0,303	-0,006
R= 0.514		R ² =0.264					
F _(7, 219) = 11.210,		p = .000					

(NAQ)= Negative Acts Questionnaire *p < 0.01

When the zero-order correlations and partial correlations between the measured variables and the dependent measured criteria were analyzed, the highest level of relationship was found to be the negative relationship between Morale (M) and Bullying, a moderate level of relationship was to be found to be ($r = -.44$, $p < 0.01$). When the other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as ($r = -.20$, $p < 0.01$). The lowest level of relationship was found between Principal Influence (PI) and Bullying, which was found to be ($r = -0.21$); however, when the other variables were checked, the correlation between the two variables was $r = -0.10$.

There was a moderate level relationship and a negative relationship between the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-S) sub-scales and the Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ). It can be seen that there was a medium level negative relationship when the

other variables were checked.

There was a significant moderate level relationship between all sub-scales of the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-S) scale and the Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ) ($R=0.514$, $R^2=0.264$, $P < 0.01$). All sub-scales of the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-S) and the Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ) explain the 26% total variance.

According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the criteria's ranking order in terms of significance was as follows: Morale (M), Consideration (C), Institutional Integrity (II), Principal Influence (PI), Initiating Structure (IS), Resource Support (RS), and Academic Emphasis (AE). When the t-test results for the significance of regression coefficients were analyzed, it was observed that the variables Morale (M) and Consideration (C) were significant criteria for bullying. Other variables did not have significant effects. The regression equation (mathematical model) on bullying criteria, in accordance with the results of the regression analysis, is given below:

Table 5. Results of Regression Analysis

Bullying = - 0,380 (II) - 0,306 (IS) - 0,496 (C) + 0,434 (PI) - 0,025 (RS) - 0,445 (M) - 0,016 (AE)

The Regression analysis for the bullying criteria in, accordance with the total scores of the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-S) and Negative Acts Questionnaire ((NAQ), are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Multiple Regression Analysis

	B	Standard Error	β	t	p	Correlations Zero-order	Partial
Constant	46.483	2.882	-	16.129	.000	-	-
OHI-S Total	-.212	-.027	-.460	-.767	.000	-.460	-.460
R= 0.460		R ² =0.211					
F _(1, 225) =60.334		p = .000					

(NAQ)= Negative Acts Questionnaire *p < 0.01

When the zero-order correlations and the correlations between

the criteria variables and the dependent variable were analyzed, it was observed that there was a negative moderate-level relationship between the total scores of the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-S) and bullying ($r = -.46$, $p < 0.01$). There was a moderate level significance relationship between the total scores of the Organizational Health and the bullying scores of the teachers ($R = 0.514$, $R^2 = 0.211$, $P < 0.01$). The Organizational Health Inventory total scores explain the 21% total variance in bullying. When the t-test results for the significance of the regression coefficient were analyzed, it was observed that the Organizational Health total scores were significant criteria for bullying.

Discussion

The first subproblem of the research was: What was the primary school teachers' opinion on the organizational health of their schools? It was observed that the subdimension of Initiating Structure (IS) of organizational health was more realized and that the Academic Emphasis (AE) subdimension was less realized. The organizational health scores of all primary education teachers were also high. These results are in parallel with the research findings of Korkmaz (2004).

The second subproblem of the research was: What are the opinions of the primary school teachers about the frequency of bullying behaviors they experienced at school? At the end of the research, the fact that 50% of the teachers explained that they were the victims of bullying in the last six months shows that such actions make up a general type of behavior within school organizations. Similar results were found in the research studies carried out by Einarsen and Raknes (1997) and Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2002). The continuity of such events can be an indicator of bullying. High scores on questionnaire items in proportion show that there was negative communication between teachers. For example, being exposed to rumors and gossip, neglecting someone's opinion and view, making fun of someone, being exposed to insults are the indicators of a potential problems at school (Einarsen & Raknes, 1997; Zapf et al., 1996; Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002).

The third subproblem of the research was: Was there any significant relationship between primary school teachers' views on the organizational health of their schools and the bullying they experienced at school? At the end of the research, the findings seemed to support the hypothesis that there was a significant relationship between teachers' perception of organizational health and their perception of bullying. There was a significant negative relationship between the organizational health of their schools and the perceptual of bullying. In other words, at healthy schools there was a reduction of bullying, while a decrease in the organizational health score at schools brought along an increase of bullying. Zapf (1999) found a relationship between the organizational climate and bullying experience within organizations.

When zero correlations and partial correlations among criteria variables and dependent (criteria) variables were analyzed, a moderate negative level of relationship was found between Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-S) total scores and bullying. When the relationship between the sub-scales of organizational health and bullying was analyzed, there were high level, negative and significant relationships between Morale (M) and bullying. Healthy student training environments will help to provide society with healthy products. Also, unhealthy organizations cost too much. In similar studies, Namie (1999) found that 82% of those exposed to bullying leave the organization. This represents a considerable loss to organizations. Thus, the level of bullying affects organizational performance and organizational production in negative ways.

The second highest relationship was found between the Organizational Health Consideration (C) sub-scale and Negative Acts. This level represents the respect and love of the school administrator for the teachers. This involves the open, honest and friendly attitudes of the school administrator. When the causes of bullying in organizations were studied, they found to be unhealthy, aggressive, jealous, and terse types of communication (Zapf, 1999:72). In an attempt to create a healthy school culture Consideration (C) types of activities on the part of the school administrator I culture make a contribution towards the creation of a healthy organization and

decrease the possibility of bullying.

Very low negative and significant relationships were found for the (PI) sub-scale. This finding suggests the need for school administrators to influence their seniors. Influencing seniors increases esteem for administrators. Not being blocked by senior hierarchical units is a remarkable achievement for administrators. However, this situation does not attain its purpose in Turkey due to the centralised nature of the Turkish educational system.

There is a high negative and significant relationship between the total s Organizational Health and Negative Acts scores. Therefore, bullying is an indicator of organizational health. The Bullying experienced in the organizations can be studied and some suggestions can be made regarding organizational health. The level of bullying in an organization may indicate the unhealthy nature of that organization. School administrators can be influential in increasing the health of schools. School administrators are expected to act fairly and to be balanced towards teachers the creation of healthy school environments. Frequently, wrong attitudes and behaviors on the part of school administrators are the major causes of high levels of bullying in organizations (Baltaş, 2003). Zapf and Osterwalder (1998) found similar results in their research.

Conclusion

In this study, it has been observed that among the various organizational health subdimensions, the Initiating Structure (IS) dimension was much more frequently realized and that the Academic Emphasis (AE) subdimension was less frequently realized. It was determined that almost 50% of the teachers were exposed to bullying, that there was a negative relationship between organizational health and teachers' exposure to bullying, and that organizational health was an indicator of bullying exposure at schools.

School administrators should pay more attention to interpersonal relations to create healthy schools. They should intervene in the bullying between teachers and students to settle disputes. They should make an effort to ensure the health of their schools. They should establish positive relationships within the school environment. They should meet the expectations of the internal and

external clients of the school with no deviation from the school objectives. They should protect teachers against the pressure groups surrounding the school. They should provide a healthy educational-training environment for the teachers. They should integrate the school objectives with the teachers' objectives.

Taking this research as a attending point, the following research may be carried out: First, research on the relationship between the leadership styles of school administrators and the incidence of bullying; second, the relationship between leadership and school culture; third, the psychological and other effects experienced by teachers subjected to bullying.

References

- Akbaba, S. (1997). Örgüt sağlığı. [Organizational health in Middle School]. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Ankara: Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences.
- Akbaba, S. (2001). Örgüt sağlığı. [Organizational health]. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.
- Allison, M. David. (1992). Organizational health and student achievement in Missouri public high schools. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 14 (7), (UMI No.2393-A).
- Altun, S. A. (2001). Örgüt sağlığı. (Organizational health). Ankara: Nobel Publishing.
- Artan, İ. (1986). Örgütsel stres kaynakları ve yönetimi üzerine bir pratik çalışma. [A practical work on organizational stress sources and Manager]. İstanbul: Basisen Kültür ve Eğitim Yayınları.
- Ash, P. M. (1992). Organizational health and teacher stages of concern about an innovation. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 53, (UMI No.6).
- Aslan, M. (1995). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel stres kaynakları. [Organizational stress sources of teachers]. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, İnönü University, Malatya, The Institute of Social Sciences. Turkey.
- Ataklı, A. (1999). Öğretmenlerde stres ve iş doyumunu. [Stress and job satisfaction of teachers]. *Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi*, 146 (3), 16-32.
- Baltaş, A. *Adı yeni konmuş bir olgu: İşyerinde yıldırma. [A newly named phenomenon: Harrsahment at the office]*. Retrieved October, 18, 2005 from <http://www.baltas.com>
- Başaran, İ. E. (1991). Örgütsel davranış. [Organizational behavior]. Ankara: Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Publications.
- Borg, G. M. & Riding, J. R. (1991). Occupational stress and job satisfaction among school administrators. *Journal Of Educational Administration*, 31 (1), 4-21.

- Boyle, G. J., Borg, M. G., Falzon, J. M., & Baglioni, A. J. (1995). A structural model of the dimensions of teacher stress. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65 (2), 49-67.
- Brodsky, C. (1976). *The harassed worker*. Toronto: Lexington Books, DC Heath and Company.
- Brookover, W. B., Switzer, J. H., Scheinder, J. M., Brady, C. H., Flood, P. K., & Wiesenbaker, J. M. (1987). Elementary school climate and school achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 15, 301-318.
- Brooks, L. & Perot, A. R. (1991). Reporting sexual harassment: Exploring a predictive model. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 31-47.
- Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K. & Hjelt-Back, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior*, 20, 173-184.
- Capel, S. A. (1991). A longitudinal study of burnout in teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 61, 36-45.
- Childer, J. H. & Fairman, M. (1986). The school counselor as facilitator of organizational health. *The School Counselor*, 5, 332-337.
- Clark, E., & Fairman, M. (1983). Organizational health: A significant force in planned change. *NASSP Bulletin*, September, 108- 113.
- Conley, D.T. (1992). The Vision thing and school restructuring. *OSSC Report* 32, 2 (Winter) 1- 8 Eugene: Oregon School Study Council. ED 343 246.
- Davenport, N. (2003). Bullying: Emotional harassment in the work place. (Çev. Osman Cem ÖNERTOY).
- Davis, J. (1989). "Effective schools, organizational culture and local policy initiatives". In Educational Policy For Effective Schools. New York: Teacher College Pres.
- Demir, K. (1997). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin ve okul yöneticilerinin örgütsel stres kaynakları. [Sources of stress in school managers and teachers in secondary schools]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.. Ankara University, Ankara, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Turkey.
- Dick, R. Van & Wagner, U. (2001). Stres and strain in teaching: A structural equation approach. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 243-259.
- Doubtfire, D. (1997). Ways to get along well with people. (Çev. Evren KAYRA), İstanbul: Rota Yayınları.
- Einarsen, S. & Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 185-201.
- Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20, 16-27.
- Einarsen, S., Raknes, B. I. & Matthiesen, S. B. (1994). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 4 (4), 381-401.
- Einarsen, S., Matthiesen, S. B. & Skogstad, A. (1998). Bullying, burnout and

- well-being among assistant nurses. *Journal of Occupational Health and Safety - Australia and New Zealand*, 14, 563-568.
- Einarsen, S. & Raknes, B. I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims*, 12, 247-263.
- Einarsen, S., Raknes, B. I., Matthiesen, S. B. & Hellesay, O. H. (1996). Helsemessige aspekter ved bullying arbeidslivet. Modererende et Tekter av social støtte og personlighet. [Bullying at work and its relationships with health complaints]. Moderating effects of social support and personality.) *Nordisk Psykologi*, 48, 116-137.
- El-Hage, F. T. (1980). The relationship of selected profile of organizational variables: A measure of organizational health and an indicator of organizational effectiveness. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 41 (1), (UMI No.3A)
- Fliegner, H. R. (1984). School Leadership and Organizational Health: A simulated teaching unit. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 45 (6), (UMI No.2889-A)
- Frese, M. & Zapf, D. (1988). Methodological issues in the study of workstress: Objective vs. subjective measurements and the question of longitudinal Studies. In C. L. Cooper and R. Payne (Eds.), *Causes, coping and consequences of stress at work* (pp. 371-411). Chichester: Wiley and Sons.
- Friesen, D., & Sarros, J. C. (1989). Sources of burnout among educators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10, 179-188.
- Friesen, D., Prokop, C. M., & Sarros, J. C. (1988). Why teachers burn out. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 12, 9-19.
- Hardage, J. G. (1978). Development of an instrument to measure the task centered and internal state components of organizational health. *Dissertation Abstract International*, (UMI No.347-A)
- Hoy, W. K., & Sabo, D.J. (1998). *Quality Middle Schools: Open and healthy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Pres.
- Hoy, W. K., & Feldman, J. A. (1987). Organizational health: The concept and its measure. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 20, Summer, 30-38.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C.G. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice* (4th ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (1997). *The road to open and healthy schools: A handbook for change: Middle and secondary school edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Pres.
- Hoy, W. K., & Hannum, J. (1997). Middle school climate: An empirical assessment of organizational health and student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33, 290-311.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Bliss, J. R. (1990). Organizational climate,

- school health and effectiveness: A comparative analysis, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26 (3), 260-279.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J. & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). *Open schools/Healthy Schools*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hoy, W. K., & Sabo, D. J. (1998). *Quality middle school: Open And healthy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Pres.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E (1993). Teachers sense of efficacy and the organization health of school, *The Elementary School Journal*, 93, 355-372.
- Hoel, H., Rayner, C. & Cooper, C. L. (1999). Workplace bullying. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 14: 195-230.
- Jennifer, D., Cowie, H & Ananiadou, K. (2003). Perception and experience of workplace bullying in five different working populations. *Aggressive Behavior*, 2, 489-496.
- Kayum, A. (2002). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin stres kaynakları. (Organizational stress sources of primary schoolmanagers)*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Malatya: İnönü University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Kimpston, R. D., & Sonnabend, L. C. (1975). Public secondary schools: The interrelationships between organizational healthy & innovativeness & between organizational health & staff characteristics, *Urban Education*, 10 (1), 27-44.
- Korkmaz, M.(2004). İlköğretim okullarının örgüt sağlığı ile güçlü okulvizyonu arasındaki ilişki. [The relationship between organizational health and robust school vision in elementary school]] *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, 18 (4), 473-488.
- Kyriacou, C., Sutcliffe, J. (1978). A model of teacher stress. *Educational Studies*, 4, 1-6.
- Leymann, H. (1990). Bullying and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims*, 5, 119-126.
- Leymann, H. (1993). *Bullying*. Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of bullying at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 165-184.
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of bullying at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 165 - 184.
- Licata, J. W, & Harper, G. W. (2001). Healthy schools, robust schools and academic emphasis as an organizational theme. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37 (5), 463 – 475.
- Logan, C.S. (1993). Structural coupling, robustness, and effectiveness of schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 31, 4, pp.19-32.
- Mikkelsen, E. G. & Einarsen, S. (2002). Relationships between exposure to bullying at work and psychological and psychosomatic health complaints: The role of state negative affectivity and generalized self-efficacy. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 43, 397-405

- Miles, M. B. (1969). Planned change & organizational health: Figure and ground. In F.D. Corver & T.J. Sergiovanni (Eds). *Organizations and Human Behavior*, (p p.375 – 391). New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Özdayı, N. (1990). *Özel ve devlet okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin iş doyumu*. [Comparative analysis of job satisfaction of the teachers working at formal and private high schools and their job stress]. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Istanbul: Istanbul University.
- Parsons, T., Bales, R.F., & Sils, E. A. (1953). *Working papers in the theory of action*. Glencoe, IL: Free Pres.
- Parsons, T. (1967). Some ingredients of a general theory of formal organization. In A. W. Halpin (Ed), *Administrative Theory in Education* (pp. 40-72) -. New York: Macmillan.
- Pehlivan, İ. (1993). *Eğitim yöneticisinin stres kaynakları*. [Sources of stress in education management]. Unpublished Master's thesis, Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Podgurski, T. P. (1990). School effectiveness as it relates to group consensus and organizational health of elementary schools. Dissertation Abstract International, 51 (11), (UMI No.3587- A).
- Randall, P. (1997). *Adult bullying: Perpetrators and victims*. London: Roudledge.
- Ransom, M. P. (1991). A study to determine the relationship between elements of participative management and organizational health. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 51 (11), (UMI No.3587-A)
- Salmivalli, C., Lappalainen, M., & Lagerspetz, K. (1998). Stability and change of behavior in connection with bullying in schools: A two-year follow-up. *Aggressive Behavior*, 24, 205-218.
- Scherrey, A. P. (1991). The relationship between self actualization of principals and the organizational health of their schools. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 52 (2), (UMI No.380-A)
- Trasher, B. J. (1980). Relationship between administrative stress and organizational health. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 41 (5), (UMI No.1888-A)
- Tümkiye, S. (1996). *Öğretmenlerdeki tükenme: Öğretmenlerde görülen psikolojik semptomlar*. [Exhaustion in Teachers; psychological symptoms observed and cope-with behaviors]. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation., Adana: Çukurova University, Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Vartia, M. (1996). The sources of bullying -- psychological work environment and organizational climate. *The European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 203-14.
- Westhues, K. (2004). *Administrative bullying at the university of Toronto*. Ontario: The Edwin Melen Press.
- Willower, D.J., & Jones, R.G. (1965). When pupil control becomes an organizational theme. In E. Wandt (Ed), *A Cross-Section of Educational Research*. New York: David McKay

- Yüçetürk, E. (Ct) (2003) *Örgütlerde bitmeyen uygulamalar. [Unstoppable Daunting Practices within Organizations: A Dream or Reality?]*. Retrieved October 6, 2003 <http://www.bilgiyonetimi.org/cm/pages>
- Yüçetürk, E. (2003) *Örgütlerin karanlık yüzü: Bullying. (The Dark Side of the Organizations: Bullying)*. Retrieved September 12, 2003 from <http://www.bilgiyonetimi.org>
- Zapf, D., Knorz, C. & Kulla, M. (1996). On the relationship between bullying factors, and job content, social work environment and health outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 215-237
- Zapf, D. and Osterwalder, P. (1998). *Organizational Causes of Workplace Harassment*. Department of Psychology, J. W. Goethe-University Frankfurt.
- Zapf, D. (1999). Organizational, work group related and personal causes of bullying/bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 1, 70-85.